THE CASE

OF THE

Irish Protestants:

In Relation to

RECOGNISING,

OR

Swearing ALLEGIANCE to,

And PRAYING for

King WILLIAM and Queen MARY,

Stated and Resolved.

LONDON,

Printed for *Robert Clavel*, at the *Peacock* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCXCI.

UMI

Advertisement.

THE *following Paper contains the Result of a certain Persons Thoughts, sometime since, when he, being cut off from the usual means of* consulting with others, *could only enter into a* Consultation with himself, *for* resolving his own Conscience.

It is no mans sin *simply to* doubt, *but it is* every mans business *to endeavor his own* Satisfaction: *and 'tis* some mens Duty *to* satisfie others *besides themselves.*

Of this number, *because the Author took himself to be, he* communicated *these his Thoughts to* such *for whom he was* concern'd: *and 'tis at their Promotion if they now go further.*

In his Arguing he chose for Satisfaction to proceed rather on Foundations of Divinity, *than* Policy *and* Law: *little meddling with those Grounds,*

on which, since the Writing hereof, he finds abler Heads most to build. He is very content to leave each Man to his own Province, and only desires he may not be censured, as too ignorant, for keeping so close within what he apprehends to be his. It is indeed herein he finds most solid Content, Resolution and Repose of Mind.

God make all of us Sincere, Humble, Satisfied, and if not Unanimous, yet at least Peaceable and Quiet.

Octob. 27.
1690.

The

THE CASE OF THE IRISH PROTESTANTS:

In Relation to RECOGNISING King WILLIAM and Queen MARY, STATED and RESOLVED.

I. FOR the due *Stating*, and ſo more ſatisfactory *Reſolving* this our *Caſe*, it will be neceſſary to conſider in the beginning, *what Recognition* of theſe Princes, or of their Sovereignty, is either *expreſly*, or *by conſequence*, *required* of us; and then *what Barrs* there lie *in Conſcience*, to our making ſuch Recognition.

II. THERE can be no doubt, but it is *intended*, that we ſhould receive and ſubmit to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, as perfectly and intirely, as ever by Law we ſubmitted to, or owned any of our late Sovereigns. And I muſt add, we *Proteſtants*, eſpecially in *Ireland*, have *all the Reaſon* in the World, even from our own *Intereſt* to do it, with *more Zeal*, and *Paſſion*,

than we did to either of their immediate Predecessors. But all the *Recognition*, which, as far as yet to me appears, is *expressly required* from any, is, only to take an *Oath of Fidelity* to them, and to *pray for them as King and Queen*, and perhaps as our *Deliverers* from Oppression. Now that *Oath*, as I am informed, is pen'd in a *shorter*, *easier*, and *milder Form*, than any of our Oaths of Allegiance in the Reigns of our former Kings. Thus it is said to run:

I do swear to bear Faith and true Allegiance to King William **and Queen** Mary.

The very *penning* of this Oath shews the *Tenderness*, *Moderation and Temper of these great Princes*. For there is *nothing* therein *Dogmatical*, (if I may use that Term) of which Nature was the greater part, and most of the Paragraphs of the former Oath, but only a *Sacred Promise* of (what is needful) *Faith* and *true Allegiance*. Which tho (I say) it be most certainly intended, it should be *firm* and *plenary*, (and according to the Intention of the Imposer must every Oath be understood by them that take it, else there is Fallacy and Equivocation therein) yet as to each Man's secret Sentiments there is by these *indefinite Terms* much *left* to the *Judgment* and *Conscience* of every individual Subject, what the particulars of that Faith and true Allegiance are. A *Temper* not observed in the penning the former Oaths of Allegiance or Supremacy.

III. The *Barrs in Conscience*, which any I think can pretend to against such Recognition are, *Oaths* formerly taken, and a *Recognition* made of *James* II. who is yet alive; and the *Bond* with which *Holy Scriptures tie* all *Oaths* upon our *Consciences* and Practice, yea, tho somewhat unadvisedly and prejudicially made, even to *our own Hurt and Damage*. The Oaths, I think, which can stick upon any are chiefly Two, The *Oath of Allegiance*, and of *Supremacy*. Yet there is also, if I mistake not besides these, what some called the *Short Oath*, [**Not to take up Arms against the King or any Commissioned by him,**] *imposed* on the Members of most *Corporations* in this Kingdom, as I have been

been informed, of late days. However, there is a *Declaration* in theſe Words, *ſubſcribed* and *publickly read*, or recogniſed, *In Sacris*, by all the *Conforming Clergy* of the three Kingdoms, in ſo ſolemn a manner, that it was even upon them equivalent to a moſt ſolemn Oath. The *Recognition* is that made in the late (pretended) *Iriſh Parliament* (*May* 7. 1689,) and paſt in form of an Act, penned, I confeſs, with all the Weight and Emphaſis, which, I think, either proper or improper Language could put into it. Now that the Reſolutions of all Doubts ariſing from any of theſe, may be as diſtinct, as the Brevity deſigned, will permit, we will conſider each ſeverally. And if in the end it appear, that in our preſent Circumſtances there lies no Obligation upon us, to *James* II. from any of theſe Ties, then we may with ſafe Conſcience perform what is required.

IV. AND firſt, for the *Oath of Allegiance*. This Oath *was lawful* and *wholeſome* enough, and *in former Reigns*, even *to Proteſtants poſſible* to be kept; and alſo *Obligatory*. But there are *three* things which *wholly take off* our being obliged by it to King *James*. Firſt, *he the ſaid King James* II. has made it to us *unlawful*. Secondly, *God and King James* have made it at preſent *impoſſible*. Thirdly, *we in Ireland* are *formally releaſed* from it, perhaps by *Law*; I am ſure in *Reaſon* and *Equity*. Now if any one of theſe three be true, the Obligation thereof to King *James* is diſcharged: much more, if all.

V. FIRST, I ſay, *King James* II. has *made* it to us who are Proteſtants, *unlawful* to pay him ſuch Allegiance, as was due to his Predeceſſors, and would have been due to him, by virtue of that Oath, had he trod in his Predeceſſors Steps. His Predeceſſors, ſince the framing this Form of Oath, went not about to *ſubject the Imperial Crown* and Dignity of the three Kingdoms (as *King James* has done, *eſpecially that of* Ireland, with a Witneſs) to the Power of any Foreign Prince or Potentate, no not of the Pope himſelf. Which for a Subject to do (for of Princes we will not ſpeak) is *unlawful, and Treaſon by our Laws*. We can-

not therefore *with all our might assist and defend such a King*, which yet in the Oath of Allegiance we seem to have sworn to do, because by this assistance we are guilty of contributing to the highest Breach of our Laws; we commit Treason against the Crown: And there being no Accessories in Treason, I will not say in what danger we should be in a Protestant Successors Reign.

But there is more yet in the Case. It is *unlawful by the Law of God*, for a Protestant People to assist and defend in the Exercise and Possession of Regal Power such a King as *James* II. has made and carried himself: for they could not thereby but manifestly contribute, and put their Hands, not only to the *destroying their own, but their Protestant Fellow-Subjects Estates, Liberties* and *Lives*, and what is more, their *Common Religion* too. * If it be said, the *King promised* to maintain us in the Profession of our Religion, and Possession of our Estates, Liberties, &c. He did indeed so *promise*, and I believe, of himself at first *intended* it: But he had *put the Power* of all into such Mens hands, that he *could not perform* what he had promised. Were not our *Rights*, our *Lands*, our *Goods*, and our *Churches* themselves taken from us, *contrary*, not only *to his Promises*, but *Proclamations*? And which of any of these (especially our Churches) tho upon his express Command, under his Hand and Seal, was ever restored? What can be expected from him, who first *incapacitates* himself to *perform*, and then *makes fair Promises*? Did not the *Irish Act of Attainder debar* the King of his Prerogative to *pardon* those which it made Criminals and Traitors (contrary to the Law of Nature, that common Test of Equity, so much appealed to by some in the late *Irish* House of Lords,) for flying merely to preserve their Lives, or securing themselves from *Irish* Mercy, that is, from —— what I will not say. Nor will I insist upon, what I might add and aggravate: By the Constitution and *Laws of the Religion he professes*, he either *had sworn to destroy*

* The proof of these Particulars by some Historical Instances, in the Treatment which the poor *Irish* Protestants found from those in Power under the late King, would cast such *Odium* on more perhaps than were guilty, that I cannot persuade my self to set it down: and possibly it is so notorius, that I need not. Enough has fallen from my Pen in the Sequel, through a kind of Impotency, or too tender Sense of what I have seen,

deſtroy (or *ought* to have ſworn to deſtroy) both *us and our Religion*. And when Men firſt *ſwear to do* a thing, and then *promiſe not to do it*, and *capacitate* themſelves *to perform their Oaths*, but *incapacitate themſelves to perform their Promiſes*, which can be expected ſhould take place, the *Promiſe*, or the *Oath*? I may ſafely avow in behalf of the Proteſtants of the three Kingdoms, there is not a conſcientious Man amongſt us, would ever have withdrawn from King *James* even our *Active Obedience*, could we have *ſecured* our *Religion and good Conſcience* by active Adheſion to him. I will add alſo, becauſe in my Conſcience I believe it; had not the ſecuring the Proteſtant Religion, more forcibly moved the *Prince of Orange*, than the Ambition of a Throne, he would never have attempted ſo *ſpeedy a Succeſſion*. In a Word, we did obey as far as God's Command goes; Gods Command is with Limitation. *Obey in the Lord*; we did ſo. We did obey as long, and as far, as was lawful, and that is as far as any Oath can bind us, for to an unlawful Act no Oath can bind. *Herod's Oath* did not bind him to cut off S. *John Baptiſt's Head*; nor can our Oaths oblige us to be Aſſiſtants, and aiding to the cutting off the Heads of innocent Proteſtant Peers, or hanging up ſuch Commons; and to the diſarming, and putting out of Power, all Proteſtants, and arming and advancing all Papiſts, and ſo deſtroying our ſelves, Neighbors and Religion. This is unlawful by the Law of God.

VI. I might here, inſtead of ſaying King *James* has made the Allegiance due to him by this Oath *unlawful* for Proteſtants to pay, have ſaid (perhaps with more Propriety of Speech) he has made the *Oath as to him void and null*. For all his Subjects, who took it, were ſuppoſed by Law to ſwear to a *Legal King*, that is, to a King who would govern according to Law, and protect his Subjects and their Rights, as by his Oath and Law bound. Such a King the Oath was deſign'd to: and actually to ſuch a King we ſwore Allegiance. But ſuch, *King James* did not pleaſe to be. Wherefore by this Oath no Allegiance is due to him. But I thought, this *notion* might ſeem to ſome more *ſubtile*, and the *proof* of it might, as above ſuggeſted, have been *more odious* than the

the other. Each comes much to the same final issue: for according to either the Obligation ceaseth, as concluded; and the Reader may take in his Candor which he pleases. To proceed then.

VII. GOD has made it to us the *Irish Protestants*, here at least, *morally impossible* to perform to King *James* the Duty which in the Oath of Allegiance we swore: Therefore the Obligation of that Oath ceaseth as to him, or which is the same, we are not bound to him by that Oath. I doubt not but that our Adversaries will say, *defending the Person and Possession of a King by force of Arms*, to be a *point of Allegiance*. I say we are here by God's Providence unable to defend King *James* by Arms in the Possession of the Crown. Not to mention, that it is not long since our Roman Catholick Adversaries, by King *James*'s Orders (as they said) took away our Arms from us; (and surely we are not perjur'd for not being in Arms for a King, who would not suffer us to bear Arms) God has now put us under the Power of the *Second William the Conqueror*, whom I must affirm (besides his being, more ways than one, otherwise justly intitle'd) to have *a Right to our Allegiance by Conquest*; that which gave the King of *England* the first (and still avowed) Title to *Ireland*. I do averr us in *Ireland conquered*, and with my Heart bless God for it. For besides our being thereby *delivered* (*intirely* and *finally* I hope) *from Popery*, we are delivered also, if we attend thereto, from *all Scruple*, which would stick in us touching the Will of God as to our Subjection to our new King: For we cannot doubt but that we *ought to be subject to them, whom God has set over us*. And when by his Providence, he so plainly *pulls down one*, and *sets up another*, we *cannot doubt*, who it is whom he has set over us. If still any will doubt, I demand of them, what should a vanquish'd Multitude, what should Men, Women and Children, brought under Subjection do? Must they all dye Martyrs for the Title of a Prince, who would not preserve their Rights by Law and Peace, and through the hand of God has not been able to defend his own or theirs by War? Do not the *Irish Roman Catholicks*, who blame us most, daily *make Conditions for themselves*, and

and ſhall it be unlawful for us to do the ſame? The great difference betwixt them and us, as to our preſent Circumſtances, is, *They* were *conquered with their Swords in their hands*; *We*, as being *their Priſoners*, perhaps they may think Slaves and Properties, as it has been too plain to us they would have uſed us. But this is in our favor: For it appears hereby, thoſe who were *their Conquerors* were *our Deliverers*; and if it be lawful in this caſe for the *Iriſh* to accept of Terms, 'tis our duty to be thankful to God that there are thoſe now come, who can give Terms both to them and us.

This Plea ſufficiently juſtifies us *Iriſh Proteſtants* againſt any poſſible Imputation to us from our *Iriſh Adverſaries* in this behalf. And as to our *Engliſh Friends*, we will ſuppoſe them more ſenſible of our Condition, than that before them we ought to make Apologies, when in our Conſciences we want none.

But as to the *Iriſh*, let me tell them farther, no imaginary freedom of theirs can now in Conſcience exempt them from this Subjection. The *People of the Jews*, the Seed of *Abraham*, were *never in bondage to any* (as free born a People certainly as *Iriſh* Men can be) yet when God put them under the Yoke of *Nebuchadnazzar*, his command by the Prophet (encouraged too by a bleſſing annext) is *ſerve the King of* Babylon *and Live*. The ſame which God ſpeaks now by the Voice of his Providence to the Natives of this Kingdom, in as much as he has left nothing elſe poſſible to them: They muſt therefore be ſubject *not only for Wrath, but Conſcience ſake*, and for Men to ſwear to do what is their duty to do, cannot certainly be unlawful.

VIII. FURTHER, not only *God*, but even King *James* II. has *made it impoſſible* to his Proteſtant Subjects to keep the Oath of Allegiance to him. For that Oath expreſly (as well as another ordinarily taken by many of us, (I mean the Oath of Supremacy) obliges all who have taken it, not only to defend to the uttermoſt of their power *His Majeſties Perſon, Heirs and Succeſſors*, but both *His and Their Crown and Dignity*. Which Crown and Dignity ſignifie (as the Oath of Supremacy, and ſo the Law interprets

interprets those Terms) *all Jurisdictions, Preeminences and Authorities, granted or belonging to the Kings Highness, his Heirs or Successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm*, that is of *England*. The *Crown of England* saith our Law is *Imperial*, and subject to no Prince on Earth; but only unto God: If therefore a *Prince* will *subject his Crown*, and so his *People*, to a *Foreign Power*, and especially to that Power, which has now these several Ages incessantly and indefatigably, by all means within its Sphere, studied and endeavor'd the Ruin of them, and the Extirpation of their Religion, *I mean to the Pope of Rome*, it *becomes impossible* for the *Subjects of such a King*, at once (or together) to the uttermost of their power to defend *His Person, and His Heirs and Successors, His and Their Crown and Dignity*. The *Kingdom of England* (of which by Law and Prescription *Ireland* is a Branch and dependent) has ever been avowed, and to this day is, a *Free Kingdom:* But how Tributary and enslaved it would become, by being again subjected to the Papacy, I list not to aggravate; yet cannot but in short take notice that the *Heir*, by the Subjects defending and maintaining such a King Possessor, *loseth of his Power and Rights:* and *so doth the Crown of its Dignity, Preeminence* and *Authority*. In such case therefore a Man can no more keep this Oath, than he can *reconcile Contradictions*; which even the *Roman* Catholick Divines ordinarily Teach, is not in the power of Omnipotence. And such is the Case between *James* II. and all the Protestants of these Three Kingdoms.

But it was *worse* with the *Poor Irish Protestants*, than with the rest of the People of any of his Majesties Dominions. *We*, though most of us *English-men*, were not only subjected to *Roman Catholicks*, but to the most inveterate of them, *Irish Roman Catholicks*, (Enemies to us on other scores besides our Religion) contrary to the *express Laws* of both Kingdoms in this behalf, contrary to the manifest *Interest of the Heir*, contrary to the *Honor and Dignity of the Crown of England*; from which as far as an Act of an *Irish* Parliament could do the feat, this Kingdom of *Ireland* was by Statute (solemnly past in that their Parliament above mentioned) in effect actually separated and disunited. The Crown of *England*

land was hereby to loſe the Kingdom of *Ireland*, a very conſiderable *Emolument* certainly as well as *Honor* and *Juriſdiction*. Theſe things are notorious matter of Fact, and ſo publickly manifeſt, that they cannot be denied.

I ſpeak not of being ſubjected to a *French Government*, *and Governors*; of our being enforced to ſupplicate many times for our Liberties and Lives, (I am ſure for the ſupports of our Lives, the eating the Bread, and wearing the poor Clothes, which of our own were left us; and ſome of us directly for our Lives, even in Caſes wherein we were Offenders againſt no Law of God or of Man, Military or Civil) I ſpeak not I ſay of our being neceſſitated thus to ſupplicate to Governors of a Foreign Nation and Language, who could not underſtand us when addreſſing to them in our own Speech, and would not underſtand our Interpreters in theirs. I ſpeak not of *Pacts and Sales*, (of which great Evidence, as to this Kingdom of *Ireland*, or a great part of it, might be given) nor of other like or more odious things; as deſignedly avoiding all that might exaſperate ſome Men, or together immoderately aggravate others Guilt as well as our Oppreſſions. But it is hereby as clear as the Sun, that if there could be degrees in natural Impoſſibilities, there lay the *higheſt natural Impoſſibility* on all (but eſpecially the *Iriſh*) *Proteſtants*, in the Circumſtances they were in, to *keep this Oath:* and that not by any fault of their own; for they were caſt into this impoſſibility by the Prince, to whom, by that Oath, Allegiance was, or was to have been due. Now foraſmuch as no one can be bound to that which is impoſſible, of all Men, the *Iriſh* Proteſtants ſtand not, by the Oath of Allegiance, bound to defend the Perſon of *James* II. in his or their preſent Circumſtances.

IX. If it ſhould be ſaid by any, *Theſe Pleas* can only *diſcharge* Subjects of ſo *much Allegiance* as can be proved *unlawful* or *impoſſible*, but they ſhall ſtill ſtand *obliged* to *what is lawful and poſſible, I allow it for truth: and together Avow*, that *notwithſtanding our Performance of what either or both* the fore-mentioned *Branches* of Recognition by the preſent King and Queen *required* of us do

contain,

contain, We both *may*, and I doubt not all considerative conscientious Persons within these Kingdoms *Do*, bear and *pay all lawful parts*, or Instances of *Duty* to our late King. And principally what the Article of King *John's Magna Charta* in such Case as this exacts: **The Safety of the Persons of the King and Queen, and of their Children,** we look upon as most religiously inviolable. None of us would attempt, or consent to any attempt, upon their Sacred Persons.

There is indeed a *Child in Controversie*, touching which it must at least be confest what a most zealous and constant adherent of King *James's* (the same too if I mistake not, more than once in great Power and Trust under him) has not doubted to publish to the World. "The business of the *Prince of Wales* has been "so carried, as if those, whom it most concerns that it should "be true, had not had a mind it should be believed, [or words to that effect, for I have not the Paper by me: 'tis intitled *Englands Crisis.*] It is to me an ungrateful task to give such Descant, or Illustration, to this ingenuous Acknowledgment, as the Case requires: but instead thereof I must be so faithful to my own sense as to add, That the Persons most concerned for the Legitimacy of that Child, have now so farther managed the matter, that I see not how its *Legitimacy* is *possible* ever to be made out to the *Publick Satisfaction* of these Nations. Wherefore, in my Apprehension, it must remain a doubt till the day shall come, that shall open all things. In the mean time, being there is the *same Reason* of things *not in being*, and of things *not apparent*, no Man can forfeit his Allegiance, for not being sollicitous for the preservation of this Child: especially now it is removed out of the Sphere of our Defence, as well as Knowledge.

As to *any other part of Allegiance* imaginable, in the present Juncture, lawful or possible, it would be considered in special what the Particulars are. Our *Counsel* would never be taken, and we have been declared again and again not to be trusted; yea and (notwithstanding the utmost fidelity of many of us) reviled and treated as such. As to our *Prayers*, what it is not lawful for us to endeavor, it is not lawful for us to pray for. But

it

it has been ſhewn King *James* has made it unlawful for us to defend him in his Poſſeſſion and Exerciſe of his Regal Power: And to bring him back thereto, as far as human Prudence (I think) can ſee, were but to bring our Religion and its Profeſſors under the ſame Yoke, Opreſſions and danger of Extinction, under which we ſo lately groaned: therefore this it is unlawful to pray for. As far as we may lawfully pray for him, we own we do: nor is it inconſiſtent with the Prayers required of us for King *William* and Queen *Mary*. Amongſt thoſe who *Err* and are *Deceived*, amongſt *Our Enemies*, *Perſecutors*, *and Slanderers*, whom we beſeech God to have mercy on, to *forgive them and turn their Hearts*, by *way of Eminency*, we tacitly compriſe our late King. In ſecret alſo, perhaps by name, we further pray, That God would take from him all Ignorance, hardneſs of Heart and contempt of his Word, and to bring him home to Chriſt's Flock, that he may be ſaved amongſt the remnant of the true *Iſraelites*. To do this for him by *Name in publick*, would be looked upon as Affront and publick Reproach: To do it in ſecret, as it is Prudent Charity, ſo it is a Loyalty we diſown not. Thus *Samuel mourned for Saul*, even when *God had rejected him*, and it *repented the Lord that he had made him King*. And beyond what I have thus openly and freely ſpecified, I acknowledge I ſee not any part of Loyalty and Devotion left lawful or poſſible to us *Iriſh* Proteſtants in behalf of King *James* II. except any would have added a *ſublime degree of Civil Honor*, (the ſaluting or ſerving him upon the Knee, or ſuch like) of which together with a *Revenue* ample enough to maintain a Court, I think there ought to be no diſpute; but none of theſe interfere with the Recognition required.

X. Now to return from Objections, and to proceed with what was above propounded. Laſtly, it is to be ſaid for the *Proteſtants*, who now are (at leaſt who all along theſe Troubles *remained*) *in Ireland*, they are as fully and directly *Releaſed* from this Oath, at leaſt from that part of Allegiance, Defending King *James* by force of Arms, as *Reaſon*, *Equity*,, or even *Expreſs Law* can be well conceived to releaſe them. In

all *Civil Othas*, if the *Power impoſing the Oath*, and to whom the Oath is made, *ſhall releaſe* the Obligees, ſuch Obligees are diſcharged of their Oath, and reduced to their firſt Liberty. Now I ſay we (the People before ſpecified) were *three ways releaſed*, either from the *whole Oath*, or at leaſt from *this part of it*, which ſome expect we ſhould own our ſelves bound to, of *fighting for King James* II.

Firſt, the *whole Oath of Allegiance*, Summer was twelvemonth, by King and Parliament, (a Parliament at leaſt whoſe Authority and Legitimacy our Adverſaries will not impeach) was in this Kingdom by expreſs Statute *repealed*; under the Name (if my memory fail not) of the *New Oath of Allegiance*. And whereas ſome Peers (upon Reaſons which are not needful here to be inſerted) ſtood againſt the Repeal of it, and one excepted againſt that ſtyle, *The New Oath of Allegiance*, the Anſwer was returned by them who ruled, aſſigning the Reign, in which that Oath of Allegiance was made; a point wherein the Objector was not at all ignorant, as I take it, but I am ſure was born ſome Ages, at leaſt, a long Age, and upwards, ſince that Reign, and ſo never took any elder, and (I am as confident) never any Newer or Later Oath of Allegiance to King *James*. Wherefore being by this Repeal releaſed from that Oath of Allegiance, and having never taken any other, ſuch *Iriſh* Proteſtants as I ſpeak of, are under no Oath of Allegiance to King *James* the Second, and that through his own and his *Dear Roman Catholick Parliaments* Act. Which being, I think, the only Service they did us, we ought not, but *with thanks*, to *acknowledge*, and *record* it to Poſterity: tho what Service thereby they did THEIR King (as appropriating him to themſelves they uſed to call him) we muſt leave him and them together at their leiſure to conſider.

Again we *Iriſh Proteſtants* were not only *diſarmed*, as above-ſaid, but by iterated Proclamations *interdicted*, to have any kind of *Arms* in our *Houſes*, tho merely for the *Defence* of them *from Thieves and Robbers:* and that under *divers Forfeitures*, which in each *later Proclamation* were ſtill made *ſeverer*, and in the

the end, as I remember, the *Penalty* was no leſs, than being proceeded againſt as *Traitors*. How far theſe Proclamations were executed upon many innocent perſons, in City, and in Country, by ſuch, who, coming into our Houſes to ſearch for Arms, could eaſily find what themſelves had hid, I have no mind to ſpeak: But certainly King *James*'s forbidding us ſo ſtrictly, to wear or have Arms, was on his part a Diſcharge to us from the uſe of them, tho in his Defence. For what it was *Treaſon* for us *to Have*, how could it be *Allegiance* or *Duty* for us *to Uſe*?

Laſtly, it muſt not be omitted here, what is with the greateſt Aſſurance reported by Multitudes, even of our Adverſaries, that upon the late Defeat at the *Boyn*, King *James* himſelf told his *Iriſh* Commanders, then about him: 'He ſaw their Men 'would not ſtand, and they had nothing to do to think of 'conteſting with ſuch an Army, as was againſt them; commanded 'too by ſuch a Prince for their General. He therefore adviſed 'them to ſhift for themſelves, as, he ſaid, he would do [and in-'deed did] and to make the beſt Terms they could for them-'ſelves. The ſame in effect, as is teſtified by many, he afterwards repeated at his paſſage through *Dublin*; and 'tis plain he *confirmed* theſe his Sentiments by his *practice*. Now what was ſaid to them, we cannot but take as (implicitly at leaſt) reaching and extending it ſelf to *all his People in* Ireland, then in ſubjection to him; as I am ſure were we, touching whom the preſent Conſultation proceeds: Wherefore we were then releaſed amongſt others, and left to our ſelves, to make Terms; and the Conqueror allowing us no other Terms but theſe, we are therefore by this Releaſe (if we had not been ſo before) at liberty to embrace and accept them.

We have then thus done with the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, together with the Obligation of them both, as to King *James* the Second.

XI. It follows we proceeed to the *Oath* or *Declaration* of **Not taking up Arms againſt the King, or any Perſons commiſſionated**

missionated by him, extant in the *Act of Uniformity* (Anno Dom. 1662.) and either taken or subscribed and avowed publickly by very many of us. Touching this, I will not say what I have heard some Learned in our Laws have said, that this Declaration is not to be found in the Original record of that statute IN TERMINIS as in our Books, but has been corruptly and surreptitiously inserted (as it stands) into the Printed Copy. If this be true, it was an abominable Wrong and Imposition on the Subject; and upon whom to be charged I will not speak, nor so much as suffer my self to guess. But certainly it would in such case much take off from the Obligation of that Oath or Declaration, that it should be so fraudulently and illegally imposed. *My Answer* then *is*; I conceive *Most*, I might have said *all Irish Protestants* have *little to do* with *this Oath* in the present juncture. For either we are *already in Arms*, or *Not*. Those of us who are *already in Arms*, cannot but be presum'd to be *satisfied*, touching the lawfulness of that War, wherein we now are engaged, and are not *after Vows to make Enquiry*. To me truly *the satisfaction* seems *easie*: For a Commission contrary to Law (as are all Commissions of late years granted, or in present being to *R. Catholicks*) is by Law no Commission, and consequently the Persons who bear it *not commissionated* but *private men*, or rather while they Act pursuant to such Commissions, *Publick Robbers*; which point justified all that rose against *Tyrconnell*, or any other R. Catholicks in this Kingdom pretending to Commissions from K. *James*. And if K. *James* would put himself at the head of such a body to countenance, and abet them, I do not see how his presence (even if he had been in full possession of his Crown) could give them more Authority; Since he could onely thereby make himself less a Legal King, not them more Legal Officers. And the same thing (if there were no more) still justifies those who now fight against them that act in his name: Not to speak that K. *James* has otherwise here *Un King'd* himself; for certainly a King, which *releases his Subjects* of their *Allegiance*, as we have shewn him to have done, is *no longer their King*.

Those

Thoſe who are *not yet in Arms*, if they have any ſcruple, for which I profeſs I ſee no reaſon, may forbear taking Arms in that Cauſe, wherein they are not ſatisfied. I do not ſee any compulſory means uſed to bring them into Arms. It is *not required* of us all *to fight*, but all of us are to promiſe to be quiet and to pray for our Protectors, which certainly all may do without touching on any thing in that (whether) Oath or Declaration. Wherefore in ourpreſent condition theſe alſo are out of Doors.

XII. We are in the next place to conſider the *Recognition*, which was made perſonally of *James* the *Second* in the late (pretended) *Parliament* of *Ireland*. As to which parliamentary Act (be it what it can be) it muſt be ſaid, *No Iriſh Proteſtant*, even of thoſe few that were preſent in either Houſe, are *accomptable* for the very Body and Frame of it, much leſs for every particular Expreſſion or even Clauſe therein. It was the firſt Act that was paſt, and truly precipitated. It was not admitted to any due debate (at leaſt in the Lords houſe) and ſome who in the end earneſtly deſired the alteration but of one Expreſſion, which was apprehended to be improper Language, could not ſpeed therein. Now thoſe who would not at our importunity, alter their ſtyle, would not for our ſakes have waved any of their fundamental materials, of which they were much more fond. What *Perpetual dread* and *Moral Force*, all the proteſtant members were under, I am very unwilling, if not unable, to ſpeak. It ſufficiently ſpeaks for them, that as many of them as by their quality were capacitated to proteſt, *did proteſt* againſt all the more Momentous Acts that paſſed, this haply being excepted, againſt which they had no time well to think, much leſs to form a Proteſt: the Act being firſt brought in to the Houſe of Lords, there read haſtily three times (for Forms ſake rather than otherwiſe) and, to the beſt of my memory, immediately ſent down to the Commons, and never by the Proteſtant Lords heard of again, till brought in for the Royal Aſſent. Beſides this, having been all along kept *in the dark*, the Proteſtants there

knew

knew not on what bottom, or in what posture, things stood in *England*, (a *Regency* and many such Expedients were whispered up and down.) Nor had they had experience, how a *Royal Catholick* would *keep* his *renewed Promises* with *Hereticks*. (Possibly they thought his own Misfortunes might have taught him, if not better Faith, yet more of Government.) And finally, *none* could either with *safety* of their Liberties, or even Lives, *have protested*. To have spoken against this Act, had been to have struck at the Foundation of the Authority, not only of that (whatsoever it was of a) Parliament, jealous and tender enough be sure of its own Power, but even of the whole Government of the Kingdom in all its Branches. And it was as clear as the Sun, such person would have been either, *ipso facto*, by Vote of both Houses executed for Treason; or if he had got out of the Protection of either House, been forthwith *De Witted*, and torn in pieces by the Multitude.

In a word, let this Recognition be of all the force and exactness imaginable to oblige us, it was extorted from us *Vi et Dolo malo*. And how far then it can oblige being satisfied in our own consciences, we will leave to any, who will be so just as to suppose themselves to have been in our case, and to judge of us by their own sense of themselves, to pass sentence. We are sure no Casuists, or Persons learned in the Laws of God or Man, scarce any man of Reason or Consideration, can condemn us.

But give it what it had not, the *Essence* and *Form* of *an Oath*, aye, and suppose it *not extorted*: After all the *same Procedure*, as above, changing only the Term Oath of Allegiance into that of Recognition, *dissolves the Obligation* of this as of the Other; for the Arguments are equally valid against both. Wherefore neither from this Recognition does there lie any Obligation upon us to *James* II.

XIII. Now lastly, as to the *Sacred Tye* with which *Holy Scripture* binds all Oaths upon the Consciences of Christian people, that they are not to *Inhabit the Holy Hill*, or may not expect to go to Heaven, except when *they sweare even to their own hurt, they change*

change not, were it our own *Temporal*, *Perſonal* or *Private Hurt* that were concern'd, there had been ſome colour of Reaſon for us to have abode both by the Oaths and by the Recognition. We might, and perhaps moſt of us would have ventured the *loſs* of our *Eſtates*, *Liberties* and even *Lives* in a *Paſſive Obedience* (as in deed we have done, and actually ſuſteined the loſs, for no ſmall time, at leaſt of two of the three) had either we our ſelves, in our *ſingle Perſons*, been likely to have proved the ſole ſufferers, or had we been to have ſuffered only in our *Outward Man*. In a word, would *ſelf-Denial* and *taking up our Croſs* have ſolved the Difficulty, we had eſteemed ſuch practice our Duty: And we can ſay without Vanity, we did really proceed therein, many times with chearfulneſs, in Imitation of, as well as Obedience to, our Bleſſed Lord; *ſuffering patiently for well doing*, as far as we could judge patient ſuffering lawful for us. But he who commanded us to Deny our ſelves, and take up our Croſs, did *not command us to deſtroy our fellow Chriſtians* and ruin our Poſterity; nor to *crucifie* with the *corrupt*, all *natural* affections. A man may indeed be conceived to have a right to diſpoſe of his Eſtate or Liberty, and in ſome caſes, or in ſome meaſure, of his Life by Honorable venturing of it: But however lawful it may be for a man to impoveriſh, enſlave, or caſt away himſelf, no man ſimply has right to diſpoſe of the Eſtates, Lives and Liberties of others: And thus ſtood affairs with us. It was not to our own or a ſingle mans hurt or two, that this Oath was wreſted and abuſed, but to the *deſtruction of the whole body* of the *Engliſh Reformation*.

Again in the duty of ſelf-denial, 'tis *only* the *outward man* or *Temporal concerns* that come within the verge of the precept; *no wiſe our ſouls* and everlaſting welfare. I am not commanded to damn my ſoul, through fidelity to any Oath; but I am rather to eſteem ſuch Oath a ſnare. Now it has been above made out, the Loyalty by this Oath claimed from us, was not conſiſtent with the common means of our Salvation; namely, not with the Enjoyment and Exerciſe of true Religion. But without the Publick Exerciſe of true Religion, People cannot ordinarily and generally attain unto Salvation. Except therefore Men can be conceiv-

ved bound to keep an Oath to the casting away their own Souls, and the Souls of the generality of People, this Rule cannot be urged in the present Case. Now this is so unreasonable a thing to bind men to, as none but Madmen would expect it from any. Who would hear a Man exhorting at this rate; be constant to your Oath of Allegiance to your King, even to the abandoning the means of Salvation, and to virtual renouncing your God and Christian Faith. Break your Dutiful Vow, which you have some hundred times iterated at the Communion, to keep an Oath once or twice sworn to a purpose, and in a sense, clear different to what it is now urged for. Perjure your selves to God, to be Loyal to your Perverted Sovereign. Damn your Souls to preserve a Prince in the Abuse of his Power. God deliver us from such Arguing, and such frantick *Misapplication* of *Scripture-Rules*, as leads thereto.

XIV. I should here conclude upon the whole, but that I have frequently heard it, not without Insolence and Scorn, demanded by more than a few, *Where is now the Doctrine of Non resistance and Passive Obedience?* I answer, where it ever was: In our *Bibles* and in our *Hearts*; and I will add too, (not without Defiance to all who reproach us on this account) in our *Practice* also.

But this being a Gird from *two sorts* of Men, some who *upon the main are our Friends*, and others *altogether our profest Enemies*, it must have an Answer distinctly accommodated to each.

XV. First, to those who though upon the main our Friends, yet seem to *reject this Doctrine*, upbraiding it of Novelty, and them, who taught it, of Court-Flattery, Compliance, Cowardice, or some such commendable Qualities, it is to be said; tho some Men *understand not* this Duty, or have possibly *misstated* the Doctrinal part of it, and others who have no mind to practice it, *will not understand* it to be their Duty, but perhaps ridicule it, yet *in due Circumstances a Christian Duty it is*, and must be acknowledged such, till the *Gospels*, (or words of Christ Jesus) till the *Epistles of St.* Paul *and St.* Peter, as well as other Canonical Books, be torn out of our Bibles, or denied to be the Rule of Christian Morals. And I must add, as to our Case in particular;

Had

Had not the *alwiſe Providence*, and ſpecial Grace of our Heavenly Father, *guided* and governed the Hearts of ſome in this Kingdom to *preach*, and of many to *practice* this Duty, during theſe our two ſad laſt years, in which ſome of our Friends fled for their own ſafety, others perhaps were ignorant of our Condition, or much unable to help us (who (by the way) dearly earned their help, in ſtaying upon the ſpot to keep Poſſeſſion) there had ſcarce been *a Proteſtant* left *in one half*, I had almoſt ſaid in *three parts of four*, of the Kingdom.

Beſides, we muſt be ſo free as to tell our Friends, it is to be conſidered not only what *ought*, but what *could* be done by us. We were *ſcattered* throughout the Kingdom *without a Head, and* (otherwiſe alas!) *diſunited* amongſt our ſelves; in moſt places, none of us could make ſo much as a fair Pretence to command one another, and in others, People would not obey ſuch as were fit or might claim ſome kind of right or color to command. We were obnoxious to, (*what we felt*) the *frequent Invaſions* of the *French*, and the hourly *Incurſions and Depredations of the Natives*; 'tis uncertain which of the two more mercileſs: Furthermore, *cut off from all Succors* (which good God! how long with wearied and failing Eyes, with ſinking Hearts did we look and groan for!) We can ſay, whatever Conſpiracy, Union or *juncture of Circumſtances*, may be conceived to make the duty of *Non-reſiſtance more opportune*, ſeaſonable, and ſo *more obligatory* at one time than another, did occur in our the poor *Iriſh* Proteſtants Condition, who were under the power of the *Roman* Catholicks. We had nothing left us to do, but what we did; firſt, to commit our Souls to God, and then yield our outward man and concerns, to what ſhould betide us, without fruitleſs (and to us certainly deſtructive) Struglings, and Exaſperations of our Enemies. We could thus *heap Coals of Fire upon* our Perſecutors *Heads*; that is perhaps melt their otherwiſe relentleſs Hearts, ſoften their Temper, or exhauſt the *impetus* of their Cruelty. This way too, there was *poſſibility of eſcaping*; the other none. And this courſe taken, was next to the Divine Protection, *our great Preſervative*, and in our Condition, as far as we can yet ſee, the *only one* imaginable:

ginable: I am sure it was the *only inducement* or *reasonable Topic*, which some of us, upon the utmost Consideration, could find out to urge to our hard Masters with hopes of success for mercy. In a word, we by *this Practice* made up a *Temper*, and *mixed* (what our Saviour taught us in time of Persecution to do) *Wisdom* with *Innocence*; and if some think us herein to have been imprudent, and others too credulous, we crave leave still modestly and peaceably to dissent: *it is a very small thing to us that we are judged of men:* Touching our Honesty, Sincerity, and through all our Sufferings, Constancy to God, to our common Religion and true Interest, (and I may add touching our Charity and upright Intentions to Mankind) we appeal to the Judgment of him who searcheth and seeth Hearts. I will, I need say no more to these our Friends.

XVI. As to the other sort, who perhaps with us acknowledge [at least, *in Hypothesi,*] *Passive Obedience* to be a Duty, but accuse us, not only of the neglect of it, but of Presumptions and wilful casting it off, we avow, and stand to our avowry, *we have practised it all along in its due latitude,* and we adhere to the practice of it at present. We have been and are constant to our selves, constant to our Faith and Duty. We never were, nor are we, of the number of those, who cry up Absolute Power, under a *Roman* Catholick King, and exclaim against the Exercise of legal and qualified Power under Protestant Princes: who therefore shew, it is not any more true Loyalty, than true Religion (or Conscience) that acts them, but Interest and blind Obedience dictate to them their Opinions, and then Faction or Bigottry governs their Practice; and that so slavishly, as not to suffer them to be impartial, in what yet for the general they approve. As to us, the Holy Word of God is our Rule, and Primitive Catholick Saints our Patterns and Examples: And from these we allow not our selves to swerve. Of *Active Obedience*, as far and as long, as with good Conscience we could, we declined no part, as above professed: When we could go no farther, or through the Suggestions of our Enemies, might not be trusted we *quietly submitted,*

mitted, even to the enduring Oppreſſion it ſelf, in its very extremity. In both regards, thus *rendering unto* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſars. We could not ſerve in a War for the Deſtruction of the Proteſtant Religion: No more did the ancient Chriſtians againſt their fellow Chriſtians; and they are reputed Saints for it to this day, even in the *Roman* Church: Witneſs the famous Caſe of *St. Martin.* There have been perhaps ſcarce in any days more illuſtrious *Spectacles of Paſſive Obedience* (The *Thebæan Legion* being excepted) than ſome *parts of Ireland* have ſhewn within theſe *fourteen or fifteen Months* laſt paſt. Many hundreds of *able,* luſty, and well-ſpirited Men, have rendred themſelves up in a body, at the cry of a Bell-Man, or ſome ſuch mean Summons, to a few People then in Power, whoſe Perſons they would have ſcorned, had they not worn the moſt plauſible Character or Pretence (there was at that time in that part of the Kingdom) of legal and ordinary Authority. We can ſay, it was only *through want of Commiſſion,* that is, *through mere Conſcience* of want of due Authority on onr ſides (which we now own our ſelves to have) that we ſuffered our ſelves (while we were ſenſible of our real Strength) to be *driven in flocks* to remote *Priſons,* (we knew not but) *as Sheep to the ſlaughter*; for not a few periſhed by or in Priſon. Mean while ſome poor Proteſtant Women, *with their Sucking Children* in their *Arms,* and *at their Breaſts,* have been *knockt down,* with the *Butt ends of Muskets,* for giving their hungry Husbands a bit of Bread in their Hands, as they paſſed by driven to Priſon. And I my ſelf, when complaining of this, have been told, *This uſage was too good for us, &c.* Theſe Inſtances and Viciſſitudes of Impriſonment and Oppreſſion, we *Iriſh Proteſtants* have ſuffered oftener than my Memory now or perhaps knowledge from the firſt ſerves to report. And theſe are *ample Demonſtrations* of our *due regard* to the *Chriſtian Laws* in this behalf.

XVII.

XVII. But some of these Gentlemen, whom we are now answering, may possibly further urge. However the quiet part of the *Protestants in Ireland* may not formerly have had *so great a share in Rebellion*, as their *Brethren in England*, yet must they acknowledge *those their Brethren* to have in the present Revolution *utterly cast* off the aforesaid *Doctrine and Practice*: and themselves now joyning with them, must needs become, if not equal, yet *Partisans* in their Guilt, and consequently be *Rebels* and *Apostates* from their own avowed Principles.

In Answer hereto, these great *Patriots of Christianity in Dispute*, but *Enemies and Oppressors of it in Practice*, must suffer us to tell them, (for it is no great presumption to suspect most of them, either through Infirmity, Wilfulness or Devotedness to a Party, *ignorant*) that *Passive Obedience* or *Non-Resistance*, as well as other Christian Duties, has its *Bounds, and Seasons of Practice*; and tho it be an undoubted Duty, obligatory to private persons, and perhaps to some small subordinate Societies of Men, yet does it not either concern all sorts of Men, or all Bodies of People; much less whole Nations. It is not the Business of this Paper, to ascertain all its Measures. But in short: Who can imagine *not resisting Evil, turning the other Cheek, giving the Cloak also*, are Duties to be Preached to, or *required of a Parliament?* Can any be so absurd, as to put no difference betwixt the private Rules of holy Living, and the publick Laws of Civil Government; betwixt means intended to bring penitent Men to Heaven, and those designed to curb or restrain obstinate wilful Sons of Violence, that they destroy not the innocent and one another? For the attaining of one end, the great Measure to be observed, is Self-denial, and abundance of Charity; for the other, strict Justice, and insisting upon particular Rights. On the one hand, in fit Circumstances, Non Resistance takes place as necessary; on the other, Resistance, where other Means will not do, is no less necessary and lawful: So that what we ought, ordinarily, to teach a private handful of People to save their Souls, we must not dictate to the three Estates, to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal,

together

together with the whole Commons assembled in Parliament (a Body of near eight hundred Persons, all of highest Quality, in their respective Ranks and Orders, in the Kingdom) as a Standard, by which they are to regulate the State. *What Sense* would it be to exhort them in Authority (and great is the Authority of the three Estates; when the King leaves the Nation, the greatest certainly in the Nation) what Sense would it be, I say, to preach to *them in Authority*, or *to the higher Powers*, to be *subject to, and not resist themselves?* But it is Sense, and the *Duty of the Clergy* to *dissuade* their People from *Revenge*, from *multiplying Suits at Law*, from *Sedition*, *Tumults* and *rebellious Projects*; and for this purpose to lay before them the Commands of the Gospel, which require of them Peaceableness, Meekness, and rather to suffer Wrong, Damage, nay, even Oppression it self in some measure, than involve all in War and Blood, which is a far greater Oppression: And this is all the Non-Resistance we preach or hold. But whereas we are now involved in War, whose Fault is it? Theirs sure who begun it, who first raised, and then maintained an Army contrary to Law, *&c.* In a word, and to speak roundly, The *King of England* is *King of three Kingdoms*; by Law *Protestants, not Slaves.* It is *impossible* for three Kingdoms to have *all their Eyes put out.* They must therefore see themselves ruining, before ruined. And it is as *unreasonable*, as impossible, to *persuade three Kingdoms* to give *all their Throats to be cut.* No Law of God, or Man, can be thought to oblige them hereto. For any therefore to think, that as the three Kingdoms see, so they should not withstand their own Ruin, or which is much the same, that the Duty of Non-Resistance should take place in such a Case as this, is for him to forfeit all Sense and Reason, or to become really mad, that he may seem to be Religious. Wherefore when things have their true Names, either *English or Irish Protestants* taking *Protection under a Protestant Prince*, whose just Assertion of his own Rights necessarily involved also their Defence (and this at a time when their own King had cast them off from Protection) must be acknowledged *no Rebellion:* I avow them who thus fly for, seek, or accept, Protection to be as Passive as any where the Gospel requires them. XVIII.

XVIII. But it will be said, in respect of the *Invaders*, there must at least be acknowledged an *Offensive War*. Be it so, yet was it a most just one. For the *Prince of Orange* was *no Subject*, and therefore could *not be a Rebel*; and the Causes which he had to enter *England*, when he did, and in the manner in which he did, with armed Force, were both more in number, and for Weight and Justice far greater, than it can be expected should be represented in this Paper. Nor was his Advancement to the Throne less just and equitable. I do not find that they, who have impartially considered all, can assign any thing that could be done, more *reasonable*, and as far as Man can see, more *wholesome to the Interest of Religion* and *Peace*, whether in the *three Kingdoms*, or even in *Christendom* it self. But these things have been undoubtedly deduced by abler Hands; nor is it needful to our present purpose any more than to point at them. *We here* have had a *long and very dark night*, and have been often *abused with false Lights*; so that perhaps we know not yet the true State of many Transactions, nor are capable therefore to discourse of them, as were requisite. *Some persons* possibly there are, *all whose Conduct* I cannot *excuse*: but the *Swearing Faith* to, or *Praying* for, *King William or Queen Mary*, does no wise *involve* any in a *necessity* of such Mens *Vindication*.

XIX. The Conclusion then [of all shall be; Out of *the Power of a King*, which would not be perswaded to preserve himself, and neither could nor would protect his Protestant Subjects; Out of the *Hands of merciless and barbarous Fellow-Subjects*, who were bent to have destroyed both themselves and their Country, and all in it with themselves; and finally from the *Lashes of the Scourge of Christendom*, God has brought us poor oppressed Protestants under a Protestant Prince. The *Case* now in short is, whether *we will accept Protection* or no? The *Conditions* indeed (say our Adversaries) are very hard: Yes, they are no less than what *God* has *made our Duty*, if not our *Necessity*, to *Swear to bear Faith*, and

and true Allegiance to, and *to Pray for* our *Deliverers*, and their *Conquerors*, in that Quality wherein we find them, and wherein they have Delivered us, and Conquered them. That is to promise sacredly to Man such Subjection, and to make to God such Prayers, which in our present Condition, even without such Promise, it were sin not to do. In the whole Revolution God has not vouchsafed to us such *Irish* Protestants (who are mainly concerned in this Paper) any active part in advancing these Princes to their Power: He has thought fit to assign us still only a *Passive Lot*. We must acknowledge it is not, it has not been our Business to set up Powers: but yet we must own it is our Duty to obey them. And no less (certainly) to be thankful to God and them, if we may be protected by them. The Scripture is express, *Let every Soul be subject to the higher powers.* Such certainly the *Conquerors are.* And, *I exhort, that first of all Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made for all Men, for Kings, and all that are put in Authority*; [even for the person of a *Nero* therefore at that time:] and if *for the froward*, much more *for the good and gentle.*

Let us chearfully then comply in both points, and *lay down* not our *Conquered Arms* (for Arms we Protestants have not been now a long time suffered to wear,) but our *captivated Hearts*, at the *Feet of* King WILLIAM and Queen MARY, whom *God long preserve.*

AND, *O thou who hast hitherto delivered us from our Enemies, Deliver us now from our selves. Let there be no* Shimei *or* Sheba *in our* Israel: *But bow thou the Hearts of all the Tribes as one Man, that they may establish the Kingdom in their Majesties, whom thy Hand and out stretched Arm has now set over us. Do thou, O King of Kings, defend these the true Defenders of the Faith, and make their Arms by Land and Sea Victorious, for the Reformation (if it might be thy Will) at least for the Pacification of Christendom; that we whom thou hast saved from the Hands of*

our Enemies, may serve thee without fear, in Holiness and Righteousness before thee all the Days of our Life; and these Kingdoms may flourish, in Truth and Sanctity, in Peace and Plenty, to the Glory of thy Name, and of the Blessed Memory of our Deliverers to all Posterity. Amen.

FINIS.

Some

Some BOOKS *lately Printed for* Robert Clavel.

Roman Forgeries in the Councils, during the first four Centuries, together with an *Appendix* concerning the Forgeries and Errors in the Annals of *Baronius*. By *Thomas Cumber*, D. D. Præcentor of *York*.

A Scholastical History of the Primitive and general Use of Liturgies in the Christian Church, together with an Answer to Mr. *David Clarksons* late Discourse concerning Liturgies, in two parts in Octavo. By *Thomas Cumber*, D. D.

Seasonable Reflections on a late Pamphlet, Entituled, A History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation, wherein the true Notion of Passive Obedience is setled and secured from the Malitious Interpretations of ill designing Men.

The Golden Rule, or the Royal Law of Equity Explained.

A Sermon Preached before the Court of Aldermen, and City of *London*, at *Guild-Hall* Chappel, on *Sunday December 16th*, 1688. Both by *J. Goodman*, D. D.

The Frauds of the *Romish* Priests and Monks, set forth in Eight Letters, lately written by a Gentleman in his Journey into *Italy*.

A late Letter concerning the Proceedings in *Scotland*, and Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland*, in Quarto. price 6 *d.*

Political Arithmetick, or a Discourse concerning the Extent and Value of Lands, People, Buildings; Husbandry, Manufacture, Commerce, Fishery, Artizans, Seamen, Soldiers; Publick Revenues, Interest, Taxes, Superlucration, Registries, Banks; Valuation of Men, Increasing of Seamen, of Militia's, Harbors, Situation, Shipping, Power at Sea, *&c.* As the same relates to every Country in general, but more particularly to the Territories of His Majesty of *Great Britain*, and his Neighbors of *Holland*, *Zealand*, and *France*. By Sir *William Petty*, late Fellow of the *Royal Society*.

1552

Some BOOKS lately Printed for Robert Clavel.

64156